

MINUTES OF MEETING

Olympia Planning Commission Meeting
Monday, May 21, 2012
Olympia City Hall, Council Chambers
601 4th Avenue East
Olympia, WA

Call to Order

Chair Tousley called the meeting to order at 6:34 p.m.

Attendance

Members Present: Judy Bardin, Roger Horn, Agnieszka Kiswa, Larry Leveen, James Reddick, and Rob Richards

Excused: Paul Ingman, Jerome Parker, and Amy Tousley

City of Olympia Staff: Associate Planners Amy Buckler & Stacey Ray, Planning Manager Todd Stamm, and Community Services Manager Steve Friddle

Others: Tom Gow, Recording Secretary, Puget Sound Meeting Services

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS:	
Acceptance of Agenda:	Approved as published.
Approval of Minutes	Approved Minutes of February 29, 2012, as amended.
Continued Discussion on OPC Public Process	Staff to develop an OPC public participation proposal based on feedback for review and finalization prior to the joint meeting with the Council in June.
Committee Reports Finance Subcommittee	Commissioners Reddick and Kiswa volunteered to serve on the Finance Subcommittee.

Acceptance of Agenda

Vice Chair Leveen reviewed the agenda.

Commissioner Reddick moved, seconded by Commissioner Richards, to approve the agenda as published. Motion carried.

Announcements

Planner Buckler advised that advisory board meetings with less than a simple majority may be conducted. However, no official action may be taken.

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) selected Olympia for a walkability audit this summer. EPA representatives will visit the City with local representatives to assess the City's walkability. TRPC is involved in the effort and the City extended invitations to Lacey and Tumwater to join the walk. TRPC is extending an invitation to the three local councils and planning commissions to participate in the walk, tentatively scheduled on August 11. Tour locations have not been identified at this point.

Approval of Minutes

Regular Meeting: February 29, 2012

Vice Chair Leveen asked staff to follow up on a motion (page 5) directing staff to develop language addressing an exemption for streetlights and utility poles in all reaches within the Shoreline Master Program.

Several corrections were requested to the minutes changing "grading" on pages 6 and 7 to reflect "grating."

Commissioner Reddick moved, seconded by Commissioner Richards, to approve the minutes of February 29, 2012, as amended. Motion carried.

Public Communication

There were no public comments.

Briefing: Permanent Homeless Encampment Amendment to Comprehensive Plan

Community Services Manager Steve Friddle reviewed the previous action beginning in June 2010 to amend the Zoning Code to allow a permanent homeless encampment on county-owned property within the City limits. The ordinance adopted by the Council in September 2011, was appealed to the Growth Management Hearings Board, which ruled that the City must amend its development regulations for compliance with the Olympia Comprehensive Plan.

The Board concluded that the City of Olympia actions and adoption of the ordinance violated the RCW. Most of the issues were dismissed except for one. The decision conveyed that the Board was well aware that homelessness is a pervasive problem throughout Washington State and the nation. Thurston County, the City of Olympia, Panza, and the homeless community are to be congratulated for their efforts to address the issue in the Thurston County area. The Board is also aware of the difficulty of siting certain types of uses, as often they are perceived both accurately and inaccurately as detrimental or incompatible with the area's existing uses. The City of Olympia may very well achieve its goal of establishing a permanent homeless encampment whether in the Mottman Industrial Park or elsewhere. In order to do so, the City's actions are required to comply with the Growth Management Act and in this sense the Board concludes that those actions fell short. The Board directed the City to bring its ordinance in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. In the ruling, the City was afforded 120 days from the date the decision was issued. Information on the action must be sent to the Board by August.

The specific issue for consideration by the Planning Commission is the one finding the Board ruled on pertaining to two land use issues within the Comprehensive Plan in LU 18.4 and LU 18.5. The two sections of the code speak to the industrial zone and permitted uses. It identifies specific land uses that are not industrial uses. Staff believes alternative language would provide provisions for special housing and transitional facilities. Staff believes the proposal would comply with the Comprehensive Plan.

During the interim period, the county applied for a conditional use permit and the Hearing Examiner approved the request. The appellants of the conditional use permit are seeking additional reconsideration based on the Growth Management Hearings Board ruling. It's likely there will be a parallel track with the comprehensive plan amendment as well as subsequent appeals of the permit.

Manager Friddle invited questions.

Vice Chair Leveen asked whether specific language for the uses is included in the April draft of the Comprehensive Plan. Manager Friddle advised that the proposed language is not included in the draft. Any action by the Planning Commission should be included in the draft of the Comprehensive Plan during the update process. Planning Manager Todd added that a comparable amendment was included within the April draft; however, staff simplified the language.

Commissioner Horn asked whether the proposal changes the Comprehensive Plan or the development regulations. Manager Friddle said the proposal is to change the Comprehensive Plan. The regulations as adopted should remain in place. Commissioner Horn said language within the development regulations indicate that for county purposes, land could be used in a manner different from industrial. The Planning Commission discussed that language because it appeared to be a different angle for justifying the use. He asked whether the Board wants the comprehensive plan amended. Manager Friddle advised that the Board directed either a change in the development regulations or the comprehensive plan. Staff elected to change the comprehensive plan. Staff is developing draft language in the context of the full discussion and debate at the Growth Management Hearings Board. Staff is working with legal counsel to develop draft language for review by the Commission.

Commissioner Kiszka said more restrictive zoning doesn't allow for industrial buildings within a residential zone; however, less restrictive uses within an industrial zone are not as problematic. She asked about the nature of the change and whether the Board's intent is avoiding exposure to the homeless of industrial uses or pollution. Manager Friddle explained that generally intense land uses allow for a broader range of uses. Typically, it's permissible to allow lower intensity uses in higher intensity zoning. However, in an industrial zoning district, there are specific provisions for preserving industrial land for industrial uses for economic reasons. Consequently, some specific language was included in industrial zoning focusing on the preservation of industrial land for industrial purposes. It's possible to include additional uses, which is the goal of this effort.

Commissioner Reddick asked whether Panza is moving forward on its conditional use permit concurrently with the appeal. Manager Friddle affirmed that he understands Panza is moving forward.

Commissioner Horn asked whether the amendment must comply with the current cycle of comprehensive plan amendments or as a standalone change. Manager Friddle explained that the amendment can occur independent of the update process as it's been ordered by the Board.

Planner Buckler reviewed the proposed schedule, which may entail a need for a special meeting. The intent is to schedule the public hearing on June 4, subject to verification by staff.

Briefing: Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Planner Buckler briefed members on how policies within the comprehensive plan are analyzed prior to the Commission's review. The Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) will be attached to the staff report for the Commission's public hearing for the Comprehensive Plan Update. The SEIS analyzes all proposed updates to the comprehensive plan. She shared a copy of the SEIS from the 2007 update and described the sections and structure of the document. The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is required under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) to analyze potential adverse environmental impacts that may result from the updates. Traditionally, the City not only focuses on those updates that may have potential adverse environmental impacts, it also considers all impacts of all updates to ensure the analysis is included within one document. The SEIS will be released concurrently with the July Comprehensive Plan draft scheduled for July 6. The public has up to 45 days to comment on the draft SEIS. The draft is reviewed by the City's SEPA official (Planner Hornbein) with the final EIS forwarded to Department of Ecology to analyze.

The City is completing a supplement EIS focused only on the proposed comprehensive plan policy updates. The document is supplemental to the 1994 EIS. Background information will be updated as well.

The environment review is a phased process. During the update, the process will entail a broad policy analysis, which is considered a non-project action. The document is intended as a publicly accessible and user friendly document for the public. During the work on the development regulations next year, each regulation update will entail another SEPA non-project review process in addition to the typical SEPA review required when project proposals are submitted.

Planner Buckler addressed questions and affirmed that the SEIS forms the basis for the Commission's decision-making with respect to the Comprehensive Plan Update.

Vice Chair Leveen asked about the threshold at the project level for triggering an EIS. Planner Buckler said the threshold is established by WAC and is largely dependent on the size and scope of the project, such as square footage of the project, movement of dirt, and other criteria contained in the WAC. The WAC also includes some exemptions. The City has some flexibility and established a threshold of any residential use of nine dwelling units or more to be subject to a SEPA review. The construction of an office, school, commercial, or storage building over 8,000 square feet with associated parking facilities designed to accommodate 30 automobiles or more are also subject to SEPA review.

The public has the opportunity to comment on the draft SEIS, which will be shared with the Commission as well as incorporated within the Final EIS. Manager Stamm added that there is no comment period for the Final EIS

as the comments on the draft SEIS are on the quality of the analysis, such as an assertion that the City made a mistake in erosion rates. Public comments received by the Commission during its public hearing are typically supposed to be on the substance of the proposal of any particular policy rather than the analysis of the SEIS. If substantive comments are received during the public comment period on the SEIS, staff forwards those comments to the Commission as part of the package of substantive comments on the Comprehensive Plan Update.

Briefing: Feedback from April Draft Public Process

Planner Ray reported a similar briefing was provided during a recent Comprehensive Plan Update Subcommittee (CPU) meeting. This briefing is an opportunity to review and discuss public comments received to date on the April draft.

The scope of the update was adopted in June 2010. The April draft is reflective of hundreds of community comments as well as meetings held throughout the *Imagine Olympia* Phase 1 and Phase 2 process. Staff continues to brief community groups. Planner Ray shared that the Arts Commission provided positive comments on the website design and plans to follow up with written comments. Additionally, Ruth Snyder shared some information with the Parking Development Improvement District as requested by Vice Chair Leveen. Vice Chair Leveen added that he sent a follow-up email to the Olympia Downtown Association on how the Commission might be more successful in engaging the business community.

Vice Chair Leveen shared information on the availability of a web-based tool for generating pdf files of web pages to include a search capability.

Planner Ray advised that the public comment period has been extended to June 12. Staff is anticipating written comments from the Pedestrian Bicycle Advisory Committee (BPAC) and the Utility Advisory Committee (UAC). Commissioner Bardin noted the UAC submitted earlier comments. Planner Ray said staff is seeking comments on the April draft. The request for comments has been transmitted to the UAC. Vice Chair Leveen noted the BPAC is scheduled to review its comment letter on the April draft at its next meeting. He asked about restrictions for receiving input from other advisory bodies after the June 12 deadline as many boards meet infrequently. Planner Ray outlined various opportunities for submitting comments during the Commission's process as well as during the Council's public hearing.

Commissioner Richards said the CPU and the Leadership Team discussed creating a strategy/plan for outreach to advisory boards. His personal goal is to outreach to members of other boards to the extent possible.

Vice Chair Leveen asked whether goals in the April draft that are written as "end states" or where the community should be in 20 years will continue to be the framework/pattern of the Comprehensive Plan as the update moves forward. Planner Ray replied that staff believes that pattern and framework is working and no negative feedback has been received from the community. However, the Commission could recommend another framework. At this point, the framework appears to be working and staff anticipates the July draft will be in the same format.

Commissioner Horn added that the Commission established the same tone when it previously worked on the vision. The framework was intentional to assist in creating a vision for now and in the future.

Commissioner Reddick asked staff whether the City is receiving sufficient comments. Planner Ray said the City's goal is to receive comments from all stakeholders. It's likely not possible to receive feedback from 100% of the community; however, staff is working within available resources to reach as many members of the community as possible. Commissioner Reddick offered some suggestions of setting up booths in areas of the City with some advance publicity to encourage public participation in the process. Planner Ray said staff has discussed different options. However, the process is beginning to transition to the Commission's process and the July draft. Some outreach is currently in progress to some groups involved in the Initial phases of *Imagine Olympia*. At this point, there are no plans by staff to conduct "person on the street interviews." Planner Buckler added that staff only has six weeks to draft the EIS and the next version of the draft.

**Olympia Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes of Meeting
May 21, 2012 Page 5 of 10**

Commissioner Bardin asked about any earlier comments the City received from the *Imagine Olympia* process. Planner Buckler said an email forwarded to all advisory boards includes a link to information on all comments received during Phase 1 and Phase 2. Commissioner Bardin said she's somewhat confused based on advice from legal staff that the Commission should be rendering decisions based on public comments. However, there have been previous comments. Planner Ray advised that all comments from previous processes are part of the official record and can be reviewed and considered by Commissioners as part of their decision-making. She encouraged Commissioners to review all public comments from the Phase 1 and Phase 2 process.

Commissioner Richards asked staff to describe the tone of the comments received to date. Planner Ray replied that based on comments received to date, staff is considering the following:

- Is there anything that has been missed? One example is comments received by several citizens about earthquakes and liquefaction especially pertaining to downtown areas.
- Are people commenting on the substantive changes? Are the substantive changes right?
- Are these the right policy directions? Are people indicating the direction is not right or should be different or not change? One example is changes for subarea planning. Overwhelming, public comments have agreed it's a desired policy direction.
- Is the emphasis right for the plan? Some comments speak to emphasis, such as connections and interconnectivity between elements. Another goal of the update is emphasizing the larger role of sustainability.
- What is the feedback on the web-based format and is it working for the community?
- There were many comments on goals and policies as well as action items. Some of the comments pertaining to action items will be included on the "parking lot" for review during the implementation phase.
- Some misses were pointed out, such as statements that were confusing and need to be clarified.

Overall, the comments lend some positive aspects about the draft that many of the new substantive changes don't appear to be off track.

Commissioner Horn asked about next steps of the staff process and whether sufficient comments have been received from other City staff members. Planner Ray shared that a staff open house was conducted for the April draft resulting in some feedback from staff. Another internal review process will likely be scheduled.

Commissioner Bardin asked about the possibility of receiving maps of the urban corridors to help people visualize some of the proposed changes within neighborhoods. Planner Ray said the plan includes a map of the urban corridors. Staff is also working on illustrations of some concepts in the Land Use Chapter.

Commissioner Horn referred to maps and materials TRPC utilized during a previous 4th Avenue planning effort that might be helpful on visualization of high density corridors. Commissioner Bardin said it would help community members frame their comments if they had an opportunity to view the corridors. Vice Chair Leveen said some visualization resources in the Transportation Chapter are also available. Commissioner Bardin offered that it might be helpful to have display boards of illustrations available during meetings.

Planner Ray referred to the July draft and the likelihood of receiving different types of comments. She asked members to offer some suggestions on the topics that will likely need more information from the community, topics that might require less time or focus, and what type of current feedback is impacting goals and policies or could be better addressed through an implementation strategy or a master plan.

Commissioners shared suggestions and opinions on public participation. They agreed that the process that began as a broad-based effort is becoming more focused and progressing as it should. Vice Chair Leveen suggested that with limited staff resources, community members providing comments to staff, the Commission, and the Council is likely more efficient. Councilmember Richards said some of the comments reacted negatively to the urban corridors and how neighborhoods might be impacted. Density has a tendency to cause some negative reactions and represents an opportunity to provide an explanation to the community about what

the change really means. Planner Ray added that the comments reflect the change as a new proposal, when in fact it's not a change. Urban corridors have been included in the Comprehensive Plan since 1994. However, the comments demonstrate how the public process could be improved through some educational opportunities. Commissioner Richards added that none of the comments reflected an inaccurate interpretation of the intent of the policy, but it did increase some concerns about increasing density in neighborhoods. Vice Chair Leveen commented that the lack of density creates sprawl, more traffic, and less support for transit through low density development. It also speaks to the absence of neighborhood-level subarea planning where neighbors have a sense of ownership and are more aware and empowered. It just doesn't deserve a response that the policy has been in the plan, the Commission should consider how to understand the neighborhood perspective and convey the importance of community participation to create better planning, better development codes, and better buffering.

Planner Ray offered that the Commission could discuss those elements that are carried forward from the 1994 plan. It's also important to consider the scope of the update in terms of the interconnectiveness and potential impacts.

Commissioner Kiswa said that generally, the public objects to density. However, providing an explanation and creating green places leads to some understanding. The plan doesn't delve sufficiently into the details of how density will be shaped. The policies speak more to uses. What is missing is a discussion on the tools for shaping blocks of density and green space. Planner Ray replied that staff reviewed policies around open spaces, plazas, and gathering areas in the high density urban corridors. She encouraged members to review the land use policies to determine if that addresses some of the concerns. The plan also includes a parks map of existing and future park and open space needs. She offered to follow up with Commissioner Kiswa with additional information.

Manager Stamm added that during the development of the update, staff removed information in the 1994 plan concerning specific implementation tools that are used to achieve goals. The draft steps back to a higher level plan of goals and broad vision of the City. The City will use appropriate tools and techniques to achieve those goals and vision. The implementation strategy determines the appropriate tools. The urban corridor discussion is also a good example of how making the 20-year plan more accessible increased the public's awareness of existing policies and goals. There was some trepidation that as the plan became more accessible more people would access it and begin addressing more topics that weren't addressed at the beginning of the process two years ago. Consequently, staff is working through that process.

Commissioner Bardin commented that by pursuing a high level review, it's important for the Commission to consider how the details, such as zoning for green spaces, are considered. Planner Ray reminded the Commission that changes and updates to development regulations falls under the implementation of the Comprehensive Plan. It's likely the Commission will receive requests for specific changes, which will pertain to a development regulation. The goal is to avoid rewriting goals and policies.

Continued Discussion about OPC Public Process

Planner Buckler reported the Commission and the City Council is scheduled to meet on June 19 to discuss the Charter for the Comprehensive Plan Update. Included within the charter is the Planning Commission's public process, timing of deliberations, and the timeline for the City Council to receive the Commission's recommendation. It's important to reach some agreement by the June 4 meeting on the design of the public process so that the Commission's decision can be included within the charter and presented to the Council on June 19.

To date, the Commission discussed the formal public hearing process, which includes several meetings with a one hour open house followed by a public hearing to include some interaction with the Commission. The Commission also discussed keeping the public record open throughout the deliberations and closing the public record after the Commission begins voting to ensure a fair process as recommended by legal counsel. However, there may be some options for conducting a later second public hearing. Commissioner Ingman plans to submit another option as well.

**Olympia Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes of Meeting
May 21, 2012 Page 7 of 10**

Prior to the Commission's formal public hearings, the Commission discussed having some workshop or panel discussions with experts or specific stakeholders. However, the Commission hasn't formalized that option at this point.

Commissioner Horn commented that the discussion was incorporating some panel discussions within the public hearing process to include some give-and-take. It appears that the Commission can include any kind of process as long as it conducts a formal public hearing at some point in the process. The Commission could include discussions by stakeholders at each meeting; however, at some point the Commission will deliberate and render final votes preceded by a final public hearing.

Commissioner Richards said the only barrier for the Commission was leaving the record open after rendering a decision.

Planner Buckler agreed that legal counsel indicated it was possible to schedule workshop-type meetings where the public provides comments to the Commission and the Commission discusses the proposals. However, it's not just the voting aspect but rather the Commission should not be announcing specific decisions because it's important to remain impartial during those discussions. Once the Commission begins informal deliberations, the record should be closed.

Manager Stamm added that it's important to be careful to make the process fair. During discussions, it's important not to convey specific positions that might deter people from participating. Additionally, the Commission must guard against the opposite situation in that it doesn't unduly influence its position by deterring people from participating or encouraging certain people to participate. It's a fine line and a balance the Commission must consider.

Planner Buckler said another consideration is balancing the time because the Council is stressing the importance of addressing development regulations next year. The Commission should assume the Council will receive the Commission's recommendation by January 1, 2013. As part of the presentation on the charter, a discussion could be included on how other issues that might arise will be framed by the Commission to enable the Council to render a decision on whether the process should be extended.

Planner Buckler asked for feedback from Commissioners on how the public meetings would be structured prior to the public hearings.

Vice Chair Leveen commented on the challenges of limiting topics during the public meetings. The public hearings should not be restricted to specific topics.

Commissioners and staff discussed the timing of the public meetings, which will be during mid-and late summer when many community members are on vacation. Commissioner Richards said the goal is to afford as much opportunity as possible for the community to avoid special interest groups monopolizing meetings, which is why it's important to plan for as much outreach as possible. There have been some conversations on inviting different members from the development and business community to a conversational study session format. That format could be available to as many diverse groups as possible. Additionally, the Commission should invite a group of youths to participate because youth have not been represented in any of the City processes.

Commissioner Kiszka asked about the possibility of televising public meetings or providing teleconference capabilities. Vice Chair Leveen shared that a previous discussion during a Council committee meeting focused on televising advisory committee meetings, especially Planning Commission meetings.

Planner Buckler reviewed a possible scenario for the study sessions, which could include panels with particular groups prior to the public hearings to help inform the issues. She asked for input on how the Commission perceives the two-way dialogue during those sessions. Commissioner Reddick asked whether it's possible for people to sign in for specific topics of interest prior to the public hearings.

**Olympia Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes of Meeting
May 21, 2012 Page 8 of 10**

Planner Stamm asked Commissioners whether the desire is to have workshops on topics or specially invite people that the Commission and staff believe may have valuable information to share. Commissioner Richards said the answer might be both. The focus groups would be open to enable all perspectives. Feedback could be on any topic rather than topic specific.

Commissioners and staff offered ideas on different workshop/work session scenarios in the context of the Commission's meeting schedule.

Manager Stamm reported that with the Council's extension of the public comment period, staff is receiving mixed messages about the due date for the Commission's recommendation to the Council. Staff is attempting to build a calendar from September to the end of the year. The best step the Commission should consider is determining a reasonable ideal for the schedule in terms of receiving input from the public, conducting the public hearing(s), and deliberating. The Commission needs to consider how to balance those requirements.

Discussion ensued about the extensive process associated with the SMP. Manager Stamm reminded the Commission that most of its deliberations were on the regulations of the SMP rather than the goals and policies. Planner Ray added that a majority of the Commission was also involved in Phase 1 and Phase 2 and have witnessed the development of the draft to date.

Commissioners offered their thoughts and insight on the process. Planner Buckler asked whether one of the proposals is holding workshops where the Commission is essentially creating a new draft. Commissioner Horn indicated it would not be a new draft but a draft of ideas or modifications to the staff draft. It's dependent on the degree of the process, such as taking advisory votes similar to the SMP process.

Manager Stamm recommended that because of limited resources and the timeline, the Commission should decide which is more valuable:

1. Informational briefings with experts for a two-way dialogue of questions and answers with the Commission.
2. Workshops during initial deliberations involving community members with special expertise, such as downtown businesses, developers, and neighborhood presidents who would provide feedback and comments on the plan to the Commission informally.
3. Reserve time after all feedback has been received and the record is closed, and then reopen the record for some targeted topical questions.

It's likely the City does not have the resources to complete all three processes. It would be helpful for the Commission to have a discussion on the alternatives so staff can frame the proposal for the Council.

An audience member suggested the workshops should not be held during regular meetings. They should be held separately and in a different location with more publicity to attract broader attendance.

Planner Buckler asked the Commission to consider the workshops in the context of inviting developers, neighborhood association presidents, downtown business owners, and others and whether it would be more valuable to have those conversations on the frontend of the process prior to the formal public hearings or during a point within the Commission's deliberation. The Commission also has the option of adding Saturday meetings.

Commissioner Reddick recommended deferring the proposal to the Leadership Team and then presenting a recommendation to the Commission. Commissioner Bardin recommended adding seniors to the list of groups to invite.

Responding to comments by Planner Buckler, Commissioner Richards suggested the panel could be comprised of one member from each of the groups that the Commission has identified as not well represented in the public comments.

Planner Ray said it appears the Commission is concluding that it's more important for Commissioners to identify members of target audiences than topics. Vice Chair Leveen said he's not necessarily supportive of the recommendation because as a business owner he is unsure whether the business community deserves any special attention. Commissioner Richards explained his reasons for supporting the format. Additionally, since resources are limited, the only option is inviting those groups to Commission meetings.

Commissioner Horn pointed out that the discussion appears to be coming back to the original idea of providing a forum for representatives from various groups to share their perspectives followed by a 5 or 7 minute Q&A exchange with the Commission. A meeting could be scheduled for that discussion that is well advertised as perhaps a kickoff of the Commission's deliberations. It would also be important to schedule a final public hearing.

Planner Buckler offered to prepare a proposal based on the feedback from the Commission and the suggestion from Commissioner Horn for the Commission's consideration.

Leadership Team Update

Vice Chair Leveen reported that the Leadership Team met with Mayor Buxbaum on May 15 and discussed the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) process in the context of a comprehensive plan driven CFP. The next meeting is on Wednesday, May 23 with Councilmember Langer. Councilmember Langer is the Council's liaison to the Commission. Discussion topics will likely include results of the orientation and whether the Planning Commission is receiving what it needs, and a discussion on ways to improve the Commission/Council communication to fulfill the advisory role mission to the Council.

Councilmember Richards said Chair Tousley indicated that the meeting is a check-in with the Leadership Team with the new liaison from the Council. Vice Chair Leveen said the Commission will receive a full report on the results of the meeting. Another Leadership Team meeting is scheduled on May 25 as well with Ms. Dahlen on the proposed charter to be presented to the Commission on June 4.

Committee Reports

Comprehensive Plan Update (CPU) – Commissioner Richards reported that most of the Commissioners attended the last meeting. The Leadership Team discussed the composition and purpose of the subcommittee. One option of some consensus is a subcommittee of four members with a role similar to the Leadership Team focusing on the process rather than deliberating policies.

Finance Subcommittee – Commissioner Horn referred to an email to members about the outcome of the meeting with the Mayor regarding the CFP. One suggestion is providing more input at the beginning of the process rather than just at the end of the process when the Commission sends a letter to the Council prior to the Council's public hearing on the CFP. Since the letter is essentially provided at the end of the process, it has little influence on any changes to the plan. The Commission's role is to provide a big-picture overview of how the CFP supports the comprehensive plan and how it fits in with the future of the City. Some suggestions included initiating work on the CFP prior to the development of the draft CFP by staff. This year, staff proposals were due on May 4. Jane Kirkemo and staff will develop a document from the proposals over the next seven weeks with a release of the draft CFP scheduled on July 11. The Council is scheduled to receive a presentation on the draft CFP on July 10. The next Council Finance Committee meeting is on June 7.

Commissioner Horn suggested forming a group of members to review last year's CFP review and the proposed concept of initiating the process earlier. Mayor Buxbaum asked members during the meeting how the Commission's Finance Subcommittee could help the Council Finance Committee and the Council develop a better CFP. He also indicated a desire for the Commission raise the capacity of Councilmembers by helping them understand the relationship between the comprehensive plan and the CFP, identifying the gaps between level of service aspirations and current reality, and the connection of subarea plans to the CFP. There was also some discussion about revenue and the potential for a tax ballot measure.

**Olympia Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes of Meeting
May 21, 2012 Page 10 of 10**

Commissioner Horn invited members to consider membership on the Finance Subcommittee. During the review of the CFP, subcommittee members are assigned several chapters to review and provide feedback. At this point in the process, the subcommittee is having some theoretical discussions on how the subcommittee can add value to the Council's process.

Commissioners Reddick and Kiswa volunteered to serve as members in addition to Commissioner Horn. The next meeting is scheduled on May 30. Members agreed to communicate by email to establish the time of the meeting.

BPAC – Vice Chair Leveen reported the committee is scheduled to meet on Wednesday, May 23, to discuss and approve its comprehensive plan letter as well as discuss code enforcement issues and ways to involve the BPAC in some code enforcement processes.

Utility Advisory Committee – Commissioner Bardin reported the committee hasn't recently met and Chair Tousley has offered to attend the June 7 meeting on her behalf.

Design Review Board – Commissioner Kiswa reported the next meeting is on May 24.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Vice Chair Leveen adjourned the meeting at 9:28 p.m.

Larry Leveen, Vice Chair

Prepared by Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary/President
Puget Sound Meeting Services, psmsoly@earthlink.net